DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 231 978 CE 036 389

AUTHOR Stalker, Jacqueline
TITLE Historical Study of the Certificate in Adult Education Program for
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 45p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; *Adult Educators; Adult Vocational Education; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Degree Requirements; *Educational History; Foreign Countries; Postsecondary Education; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; Teacher Qualifications; Two Year Colleges; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Canada; *Manitoba

ABSTRACT

The historical evolution of teacher training requirements in postsecondary vocational education in Manitoba, Canada was investigated. Specific emphasis was on the Certificate in Adult Education (CAE) that community college instructors must obtain within a specified period of time. The CAE program was divided into distinct chronological stages and, subsequently, analyzed under the categories of product, process, and mission. The three eras were (1) the establishment phase (1971 to 1976), (2) the installation stage (1976 to 1980), and (3) the assessment stage (1980 to present). Analyses showed that the CAE program had a small, and rather insignificant impact on the product, or the quality of instruction. In regard to process, the value of the CAE program to the institutions and the province was seen to be more in its existence as a concession to a need than in its effect. The mission analysis yielded the conclusion that the provincial government perpetuates the status quo in postsecondary education by allocating proportionally more priority to elementary, secondary, and university education than to its postsecondary, adult, and continuing education division. (Appendixes, making up approximately one-third of the paper, include the CAE philosophy and description, CAE course content, and criteria for CAE instructor selection.) (YLB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED231978

# HISTORICAL STUDY OF THE CERTIFICATE IN ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS IN MANITOBA

EMERGENCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN AMERICA SEMINAR

by

Jacqueline Stalker, M.Ed.

Manitoba Department of Education

Chicago Cluster

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

CE036389

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

NOVA UNIVERSITY
APRIL 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Stalker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the historical evolution of teacher training requirements in post-secondary vocational education in Manitoba, Canada. The Certificate in Adult Education (CAE) program for instructors of adults in this province is, in one respect, unique in Canada because all community college instructors are required, under the terms of their collective agreement, to obtain a CAE within a specified period of time. The qualitative methodology used in the research enabled the acquisition of a large volume of objective and subjective data, including access to candid and sensitive information. For the purpose of the study, the CAE program was divided into distinct chronological stages and subsequently analyzed under the categories of product, process, and mission. As voluntary enrolment in the CAE program had increased to encompass educators of adults from a variety of settings, the conclusions and recommendations which addressed commitment and organizational structure were both timely and significant in providing direction for the future of this innovative program and the improvement of the educational process in the province.

CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| ABSTRACT | | ii |
| INTRODUCTION | | 1 |
| BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE | | 2 |
| PROCEDURES | | 6 |
| RESULTS | | 7 |
| DISCUSSION | | 17 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS | | 23 |
| REFERENCES | | 24 |
| APPENDICES | | |
| APPENDIX 1 | Letter, Chairperson, CAE Tri-College Committee to CAE participants, December 1981 | 27 |
| APPENDIX 2 | CAE Philosophy; CAE Description | 29 |
| APPENDIX 3 | Six content areas of CAE program | 31 |
| APPENDIX 4 | Guidelines for implementation of new subjects, approved August 13, 14, 1980 | 33 |
| APPENDIX 5 | Criteria for selection procedures for CAE instructors, adopted April 16, 1980 | 35 |
| APPENDIX 6 | Master Agreement between Her Majesty in Right of The Province of Manitoba and The Manitoba Government Employee's Association Respecting Employees of the Civil Service and Social Sciences Component Sub-Agreement, pp. 130-131 actual pp. 130-131 proposed | 37 |

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the historical evolution of the Certificate in Adult Education program for instructors of adults in the province of Manitoba. The Community Colleges in this province are, in one respect, unique in Canada for all college instructors are required under the terms of their collective agreement, to obtain within a specified period of time a Certificate in Adult Education (CAE).

In the past, similar credentials have been a requirement for college level teaching in other parts of North America, but they appear to have been phased out over time. The Manitoba requirement could possibly be related to the origin of the Community Colleges in the province, in which all three evolved from other types of institutions. Assiniboine and Keewatin were originally Vocational Centres which became the two rural community colleges. The Manitoba Institute of Technology and the Manitoba Institute of Applied Arts were amalgamated to form the large and urban Red River Community College.

All teaching staff in the precursor institutions were required to have teaching certificates. Both the nature of their work and their occupational background precluded many instructors from obtaining the usual teaching certificate for the elementary or secondary teachers in the province. Thus, they were required to obtain a "Special Certificate in Vocational, Industrial, Technology, Applied Arts, Related Subjects valid in provincially operated schools."[1] This same requirement prevailed during the establishment stage for the Community Colleges and, two years later, in 1971, a preparation program and a new Certificate in Adult Education (CAE) were developed.

---

[1] Government of Manitoba Regulation No. 55/67.

The CAE program for college instructors in Manitoba is also available to all educators of adults. Enrolment in the program has increased by approximately twenty-five percent in each of the past two years. It therefore seemed not only appropriate but mandatory that the history and evolution of the CAE program be reviewed so as to plan its direction and focus for the future.

## BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

A search of the literature led to agreement with Caldwell's conclusion that "very little rigorous research has been done on improving adult education teacher training."[2] Furthermore, a noteworthy statement by J. Victor Baldridge was that the historical study method of managing academic change had "been largely neglected."[3] This investigation of the history and the development of the certification requirement and program was conducted in order to comprehend the continuity and to recognize

> that the immediate past has a significant effect on the present by setting conditions, such as resources, issues, judgments of situations, motivations, sense of unsatisfied needs, and perceptions of possibilities[4]

for the future.

Dressel and Thompson, in their monograph on college teaching, stated that "there are many skeptics. . . who doubt that we know enough about learning or teaching to define good teaching or organize a program to prepare good

---

[2]P. A. Caldwell, in Stanley M. Grabowski and Associates, Preparing Educators of Adults (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981), p. 10.

[3]J. Victor Baldridge, "Organizational Change: Institutional Sagas, External Challenges, and Internal Politics," Gary L. Riley, J. Victor Baldridge, Editors, Governing Academic Organizations, (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977), p. 125.

[4]Mark H. Curtis, "History and Qualitative Methodology," E. Kuhns, S. V. Martorana (Eds.), New Directions for Institutional Research: Qualitative Methods for Institutional Research, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., No. 34, March 1982), pp. 55-61.

teachers."[5] They subsequently argued that instructors needed to become self-conscious about their teaching and to modify it in reference to results. They summarized college teaching requisites with the following statements:

- Teaching for certain ends implies specific behavior chosen because of seeming relevance to those ends.
- Teaching style can be analyzed, altered, and improved.
- Teaching is a complex behavior involving thought, communication, and physical action integrated.
- The teacher needs opportunities to observe and analyze various styles of teaching, to analyze and evaluate his own teaching, to analyze students' learning processes in reference to the experiences provided.
- Teaching requires a strategy and techniques for organizing materials and experiences.
- Teaching requires some basic foundation in psychological and sociological concepts and principles.
- Since teaching ultimately must focus on student learning, all teachers need to participate in interdisciplinary seminars for discussion and analysis of problems of teaching and learning.
- Every teacher should have an intern experience related to courses at different levels and it should be planned sequentially to provide variable activities and responsibilities.[6]

It would seem that these requirements might be addressed either pre or post facto, depending upon the date of appointment, the institution, the instructor, and the existence of teaching competencies and certification. Two models, both of which are applicable for the CAE program in Manitoba, have been delineated by Geis of the Teaching and Learning Services at McGill

---

[5]Paul A. Dressel and Mary Magdala Thompson, College Teaching: Improvement By Degrees, (Iowa: American College Testing Publications, 1974), p. 5.

[6]Paul A. Dressel and Mary Magdala Thompson, College Teaching: Improvement By Degrees, pp. 60-61.

University. The Instructional Development model, similar to an industrial one, is a delivery system of education wherein there is development of a program and selection of qualified people to deliver and instruct. This is most prevalent in universities and in community colleges. The second model, the Staff/Faculty Development one, aims to deliver better instruction with and by the current staff. It appears that, in an era of retrenchment and accountability, this model is gaining primacy. Neither model is mutually exclusive and both address the needs of faculty and colleges in Manitoba.[7]

An equally important consideration for a teaching preparation program for college instructors is the educational philosophy and curriculum orientation of the higher education delivery institutions. The general philosophies and four such orientations were identified by Harvey and Rovers.[8] The self-actualizing curriculum emphasizes realization of goals, growth of capacities of individuals, and utilizes curricular models advocated by Knowles, Pinar, and Rogers. The behaviourist curriculum stresses specification of objectives, content modules, means to achieve the objectives, criteria for determining achievement, and uses Skinner's curricular model. The information processing or academic rationalism orientation emphasizes the object matter to be learned, the processes required for acquisition of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes, and is based upon principles advocated by Bruner, Phenix, Perry, and Hirst. The final orientation is that of the social reconstructionist curriculum which stresses the relevance of curricula to particular social situations, their examination

---

[7]George L. Geis, Centre for Teaching and Learning Services, McGill University (University of Manitoba: Distinguished Visiting Lectureship series, February 1980).

[8]Claudia Harvey and Ria Rovers, Higher Education Group, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, "Educational Philosophy and Curriculum Orientations in Higher Education," (Toronto: Council of Ontario Universities, Office of Teaching and Learning, February 1981), pp. 4-5.

and reconstruction, and relies upon the work of Freire, Anyon, Apple, Carnoy and Levin. The authors concluded that teachers in post-secondary institutions must understand the existent philosophies and curricula so that they can be rational participants in the educational process. They must know the differences between a Tylerian "end means" curriculum with clearly outlined specific goals and a Knowles style "means" curriculum for self-directed learning.

Whereas Geis' program models and Harvey and Rovers' considerations for content inclusion are pertinent for the CAE program, so too is David Pratt's definition of curriculum and program design which is a "process of devising, planning, and selecting elements, techniques, and procedures which constitute . . . an organized set of formal educational and/or training intentions."[9] The purpose of this study was to trace the design and evolution of the CAE program since its inception so that it might possibly be modified in ways which could "often be more effective in achieving results than constructing a new program."[10]

This historical investigation should have significance for the Manitoba Community Colleges and the Post-Secondary, Adult and Continuing Education Division of the Department of Education because it verified the "perceptions of what was and what had occurred against. . . the full context of the situation."[11] The practicum was appropriate for the Emergence of Higher Education seminar "designed to provide a historical, philosophical and theoretical context within which to view such more

---

[9]David Pratt, Curriculum: Design and Development, (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1980), pp. 5-6.

[10]S. V. Martorana and Eileen Kuhns, Managing Academic Change, Interactive Forces and Leadership in Higher Education, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975), p. 10.

[11]Mark H. Curtis, "History and Qualitative Methodology," p. 60.

concrete matters as the curriculum . . . or the establishment of policy."[12] A major consideration in this study was Mayhew's dictum that "timing of the change in relation to the life of the institution is a requisite condition for success."[13] The CAE program has grown to a size wherein new directions, practices and policies must be considered and set. The timing was ideal. As "the past is part of the context of the present,"[14] this practicum has value for decisions to be made about the program's future.

## PROCEDURES

A qualitative methodology was used to investigate the history of the Certificate in Adult Education (CAE) program provided by the Manitoba Department of Education in the province of Manitoba, Canada. Documents, files, and other pertinent data, from 1948 to the present, were examined and analyzed; these included a full scale review of the program in 1976, an unpublished doctoral dissertation in 1980, and the results of a census evaluation survey of all participants enrolled in the program in the summer of 1982. Discussions and interviews were conducted with members of the CAE Tri-College Committee, the body empowered with the administration of the program. These seven individuals were either currently on the five member committee or had held positions there in the past seven years. Informal interviews and discussions were also held with over one hundred individuals who are or were participants in, or held some responsibility for, the CAE

---

[12] Edgar B. Cale, The Emergence of Higher Education in America, (Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova University, 1981), p. 1.

[13] S. V. Martorana and Eileen Kuhns, Managing Academic Change, p. 167.

[14] Mark H. Curtis, "History and Qualitative Methodology," p. 57.

program. Many of the interviewees were able to comment on the program since its inception and this provided a valuable personal historical perspective.

Although organization and nomenclature of the Ministry responsible for education within the Province of Manitoba varied during the years encompassed by this investigation, the name Department of Education is used throughout for the purposes of editorial ease and consistency of format.

## RESULTS

In 1948, the province of Manitoba established its first institution for publically funded post-secondary vocational education in the city of Winnipeg. Thirteen years later, in 1961, a rural vocational centre was opened in Brandon and a third one was created in The Pas in northern Manitoba in 1966. Thus, in the mid-sixties, the province had three vocational centres or Institutes of Technology offering post-secondary technology and trades training. In the latter part of that decade an Institute of Applied Arts was added to the Institute of Technology in the capital city.

A few weeks before the decade of the seventies began, all of these institutions were classified as community colleges - Red River Community College in Winnipeg, Assiniboine Community College in Brandon, and Keewatin Community College in The Pas. Post-secondary vocational education had grown, prospered, and met a real need within the province, however this had not occurred without problems and revisions in both practices and procedures.

Prior to the inception of community colleges on December 15, 1969, faculty in the vocational centres and technical institutes had to either hold regular teaching certificates for elementary or secondary education

or else had to obtain an interim or permanent "special certificate." An appropriate degree and three years of practical experience qualified an instructor for interim status. Completion of two years of teaching, four summer courses in approved teacher training, and a positive recommendation from a person in a specified senior position led to permanent status and certification from a provincial Board of Teacher Education.

During the 1970's, the Teacher Education section at Red River Community College was responsible for the provision and administration of the summer courses required for certification. This was a new role for the Teacher Education section of the College which had as its primary responsibility the training of Industrial Arts, Business Education and Vocational teachers for secondary schools. Its staff had neither the breadth of expertise found in a Faculty of Education nor Government approval to directly teach the CAE courses. Thus, this section acted as broker in recruiting and hiring on term assignments lecturers from across Canada and the United States. A concerted effort was made to deliver the highest quality program possible. The results were apparently not commensurate with the effort, for changes and articulation with degree programs were suggested by the University of Manitoba, the Department of Education, the Teachers' Society, and the College, but were denied. The Board of Teacher Education and Certification recommended to the Minister of Education specific changes as early as 1970; these too were denied.

Finally, in the same year, the College prepared a statement delineating a core curriculum of courses in Testing and Evaluation, Curriculum, Psychology of Learning, Instructional Methods, and two electives from other courses offered. This statement formed the basis for the CAE program.

In 1971, a proposal was submitted to the Community Colleges Division of the Department of Education that a Certificate in Adult Education be issued for "Community College Instructors and others who have completed a specific phase of their in-service training, namely pedagogical (sic) training." One of the aims of this proposal was to sunder dependency on the public schools Certification Board because there had been "delays in granting interim certification, which in turn resulted in delays in reclassification of college staff . . . which in turn . . . cause dissatisfaction of those staff so affected."[15] That the delays may have been justified on the grounds of inadequate fulfillment of requisites for certification was not addressed. The purpose of the new certificate was to "emphasize those aspects of preparation which specifically concern(ed) teaching, as opposed to subject matter of 'content' preparation."[16]

The proposal was accepted by the Division and the Department of Education. In November 1971, Management Committee of Cabinet formally repealed certain sections of Regulation No. 55/67, amended them to make the Certificate in Adult Education equivalent to the Special Certificate, and approved a new Regulation No. 159/72 stipulating same. A new certification with less stringent pre-requisites, fewer courses, and a reduced period of teaching experience established the normative expectations for college faculty and also allowed the colleges to grow and to staff the institutions accordingly.

In 1972, a CAE Advisory Committee, comprised of representatives from

---

[15] March 12, 1971.

[16] Robert John Innes, Issues in the Design of a Program of Professional Preparation for Community College Instructors in Manitoba, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Manitoba, June 1980.

the three Colleges, the Faculties of Education at the University of Manitoba and Brandon University, the Director of Teacher Certification for the Department, and the Director of Instructional Planning and Evaluation, was established. Minutes of meetings revealed that this committee's role was ill defined and its powers undefined. This CAE Advisory Committee held three meetings over a period of little more than a year, apparently proferred no concrete advice, made no specific recommendations, and never met again.

Four years later and due to many factors, a comprehensive review of the CAE program was undertaken by consultants in the Department of Education. College faculty were and are members of the Government Employees' Union and, by terms of the collective agreement between the Province of Manitoba and the Manitoba Government Employees' Association, the CAE had been defined since 1974 as a condition of employment. For faculty to either gain or maintain employment, the CAE was therefore most important. Serious concern and dissension about and within the program were also factors contributing to the review. Although the final report made cogent recommendations for improvement, the possibility of bias diluted its impact.

A recommendation from the 1976 review which was implemented was the establishment of a CAE Tri-College Committee charged with determination of programming, content, delivery, equivalencies, transfer of credits, and role descriptions for members. Membership was to be comprised of the Educational Development Officer from each College; the Committee was to be chaired by a Division representative, and the Chairman of the Teacher Education section was to be an ex officio member.[17] In practice this

---

[17] Department of Education, Review, Certificate in Adult Education Program, Manitoba, 1976, pp. 57-59.

worked well although, again, ability and expertise were not commensurate with responsibility because no active member of the committee had experience or formal study in teacher preparation.

In the seven years which have elapsed since this major review, four individuals have chaired the CAE Tri-College Committee, of whom three did so for consistent periods of time. The first chairperson was the major investigator of the review. She was replaced for a brief period by a manager who was succeeded by a consultant with experience in a Faculty of Education. During the four years of their tenure, the CAE Committee attempted to make improvements to the program, however serious concerns such as the following still existed in 1980.[18] No certificate or degree was considered equivalent to the CAE and course equivalencies with university degree work were arbitrary and could not be justified on the basis of number of years or degree of intensity of studies. Program quality and content were inconsistent and varied from year to year. Course descriptions were also weak with some containing a few lines describing the aim and others merely listing topics. Only one half course had been individualized and it was criticized and deemed to be lacking in structure, focus, and rigour. Staffing problems persisted with the same seemingly favoured American faculty members returning annually. The negative opinions and even resentment of college faculty about the CAE program still prevailed. Also, the negative extrinsic reward system remained unchanged. CAE Tri-College Committee membership was not rotated and faculty representation was never included. Certain courses were still problematic.

In 1980, the third chairperson, with experience in post-secondary

---

[18]Robert John Innes, Issues in the Design of a Program of Professional Preparations for Community College Instructors in Manitoba.

teaching, administration, and governance, was appointed. Methodical planned changes were attemped and some were implemented. Before equivalencies could be established, courses had to be evaluated, ameliorated, terminated, or replaced. Attempts were made to revise the Introduction to Instruction half course. A contract was tendered to have a new individualized course written. Unfortunately, after three drafts had been edited, the quality of both the writing and the content had not improved therefore the contract was terminated. A new and satisfactory introductory course was obtained from another province where the investment of adequate resources had yielded a quality product. A curriculum course which had been a costly and constant source of problems was revised. The course itself was retained but the poor written guides and materials were discontinued (Appendix 1). Highly qualified faculty were appointed to teach the course.

The committee began planning in earnest and not without some difficulty. Each member, including the chairperson, did not have the CAE program as a primary responsibility. Their task, inter alia, was to 'manage' the program. As such, they held full day planning meetings, submitted a long range plan and three recommendations to the Assistant Deputy Minister of Education, and had them all denied. Discouraged but undeterred, they wrote a philosophy statement for the program and re-wrote the description to make it more concise (Appendix 2). They then defined six content areas which should be included in the program (Appendix 3). Where necessary, new courses were developed. The handbook (calendar) was edited and revised twice so as to correct a plethora of orthographical, grammatical, and substantive errors.

Several new policies were also introduced. Guidelines for the implementation of new courses were developed and adhered to (Appendix 4).

To ensure consistent quality of faculty, criteria for selection procedures were developed (Appendix 5). These criteria also delineated the hiring process, requisite qualifications, national advertising, and hiring Canadians where possible. These were adopted one year before the federal Minister of Immigration and Employment announced "stiffer federal guides designed to increase the number of Canadians teaching at universities and colleges."[19]

National advertising coupled with the objective point rating system for assessing applicants not only eliminated prior staffing problems but also increased the number and caliber of summer staff. A memo from the Chairperson to senior administrators invited them to share in the committee's delight "over the caliber of the applicants for the summer 82 teaching positions". It went on to state that "unlike the small selection of previous years, this year we had a large number with excellent qualifications and experience" and that staff would include

> a Dean of Instruction and past Director of Continuing Education in a Community College, Directors of Audiovisual and Learning Skills Departments, authors of adult instruction texts and materials, a highly qualified vocational specialist, a Director of Post-Secondary Programs, etc., most with doctorates, a few with master's qualifications, but all with extensive experience in the teaching of adults.[20]

Credit hour allocations which had been difficult to equate with course duration were changed and allocations similar to those in existence at other post-secondary institutions were adopted. Discussions were then held with the major universities and equivalencies were agreed upon for articulation purposes. A statement regarding equivalency was included in the handbook however complete specificity was withheld for political reasons. The

---

[19] Winnipeg Free Press, (Manitoba), Friday, May 8, 1981

[20] March 5, 1982.

practice, at present, is that most universities grant one year or thirty credit hours for the CAE. In turn, the CAE program accepts university coursework if it is equivalent in content to the delineated program content areas.

Certain attempted changes were not at all successful. A request to have faculty representation on the CAE Tri-College Committee was denied, on the basis of cost, by the senior administration. It appeared that this matter was adequately resolved when arrangements were made to hold the four meetings per year at each home institution of the members and to offer an annual opportunity for faculty at each institution to attend and to make presentations to the committee. This worked well in theory however, when the first occasion arose at which a delegation from the northern college wished to make a presentation, a senior administrator cancelled authorization for the committee's trip north.

The committee was also unable to plan as responsibly as they wished because budget information was not available to them. They asked the Assistant Deputy Minister of Education for clarification of authority. His response detailed once again a confusing and anomalous structure and stated that "I would hope that we do not need to formalize the management of the CAE program unduly and that the flow of advice and information will not be hindered by formal reporting lines."[21] The committee which had had "authority to make policy decisions regarding CAE" in 1977 had been relegated to the status of a Course Advisory Committee having no authority and with a budget administered by a Principal in one of the Divisions of one of the Colleges in 1980. According to a memo from the Committee Chairperson, this structure made the CAE "representatives from the smaller colleges

---

[21]December 18, 1980.

feel at a disadvantage when the principal in a third college is the 'line manager' for a program which concerns instructors in all three colleges."[22]

Another recommendation from the Committee sought to standardize payments for CAE term faculty and to provide the option of hiring local qualified people. Treasury Board, in September 79, had approved the hourly rate of remuneration for Evening School or part time college instructors. This was a fair and equitable sum but was not adequate remuneration for individuals with several degrees, years of experience, and senior educational positions, teaching a CAE course on a part time basis. These same individuals "could get almost three times as much doing similar work through the Continuing Education Division or faculties of the universities."[23] Thus, government policy impeded hiring qualified civil servants on an hourly basis and at an equitable rate and thereby forced the committee to hire qualified people external to the province or the country and on a contract basis which was the equivalent to payment per course in other post-secondary institutions. It was pointed out in the same memo from the Chairperson that, "in this particular case, although the recommendation pertains to monetary policy, the change will not cost one cent more and it might yield benefits in terms of excellence of qualifications and the hiring of Manitobans or Canadians."[24] The recommendation was denied by the Assistant Deputy Minister of Education.

In 1981, the CAE Tri-College Committee identified another aspect deleterious to the program and consequently to instructor morale. Minutes of the October 28 meeting stated the following:

---

[22]December 23, 1980.

[23]September 4, 1980.

[24]September 4, 1980.

> 11, 1. The affective implications of the section of the MGEA sub-agreement pertaining to Instructor CAE Certification and Vacations were briefly discussed. The consensus was that the same statements could be made positively instead of negatively, without incurring any substantive changes. The effect might be an improved perception of the program and of continuing education. The chairperson was directed to pursue this matter with the appropriate authorities.[25]

In essence, the collective agreement was due for renegotiation. The existing agreement stated that instructors got thirty-nine days of holidays which were reduced by the number of days required for CAE courses. The committee proposed to the Head of Personnel and chief negotiator that the same statement be incorporated in the new collective agreement but in a more positive fashion. Their requested change would have stated that all instructors received the vacation as stipulated in the Master Agreement and, in addition, when instructors completed the CAE, they received additional vacation days to a total of thirty-nine days (Appendix 6). This suggestion was denied by Personnel on the basis that it was "interfering and scrutinizing areas outside of its terms of reference."[26]

Although there have been numerous setbacks, the program grew and thrived. In 1983, faculty were hired on contract to deliver thirteen CAE summer courses in three locations within the province. Participants in the program increased from predominantly college faculty and high school vocational teachers to adult education representatives from three community colleges, high schools, five schools of nursing, and fifteen agencies such as a Fire College, a penitentiary, Manitoba Telephone System, Manitoba Hydro, St. John's Ambulance, and government departments.

---

[25]CAE Tri-College minutes of meeting, October 28, 1981.

[26]Statement made by the Head of Personnel to the Chairperson of the CAE Tri-College Committee at a meeting on November 5, 1981. Documented in a memo dated November 9, 1981.

The CAE Tri-College Committee still had three of its original members, one new representative from the northern college, and the chairperson who was appointed in 1980. All members expressed frustration "with their role on CAE which is not considered a primary responsibility" and the lack of "a Division commitment to excellence." Their recommendation that a locus of responsibility, authority, and budget lines be identified "to plan, coordinate, implement, monitor, evaluate"[27] the CAE program for adult educators within the province had received no response. Members say that they will carry on, doing the best they can under the circumstances.

## DISCUSSION

The aim of this historical study was to elicit "what had occurred" in the CAE program "against the full context of the situation"[28] so that recommendations could be made for future direction and planning. A high degree of prescriptiveness is required by institutional researchers in any planning system. This is to allow the chief executive officer to utilize data and information in making decisions "that will begin to fix some of the multitude of variables comprising the institutional decision-making and planning environment."[29]

The specific methodology used in this study enabled the acquisition of a large mixture of both objective and subjective data as well as access to candid and sensitive information. The perceptions of all individuals may or may not have been accurate; the important point to remember is that

---

[27] CAE planning document, 1982.

[28] Mark H. Curtis, "History and Qualitative Methodology," p. 60.

[29] Stuart M. Takeuchi, "Planning Support From The Top: An Application of 'Miles' Law' (Where You Stand Depends on Where You Sit)," (Boulder, Colorado: University of Colorado, 1982), p. 12.

their perceptions are real, are their own, and affect the outcome of the program and therefore the education of adults within the province.

The history of the CAE program could be divided into distinct stages, related to chronological periods. From 1948 to 1971, the program did not exist and instructors in the technical institutes, which were later named community colleges, had to have a "special certificate" granted by the provincial Board of Teacher Certification. The period from 1971 to 1983 could be separated into three eras: a five year one from 1971 to 1976, a four year one from 1976 to 1980, and an incompleted stage from 1980 to the present.

In this analysis, and for each of these stages, the differences in approach, chairmanship or leadership, and outcome of the CAE program will be discussed under the categories of product, process, and mission. For each category, certain questions are appropriate. In discussing product, one would need to assess that product and ask the question, "What kind of instructors does the province have as a result of the CAE program?" This could include intangible criteria of effectiveness but should include the more tangible ones of morale and participation in the program. An examination of process can be found in the response to the question, "What is the CAE's value to the institutions and the province?" The mission can be discussed by answering the question, "What are the values and priorities of the Department of Education?"

The first era from 1971 to 1976 could be termed the establishment phase. The CAE was established by regulation 159 of the Government of Manitoba and became the required certification for community college instructors. In 1974, this was further entrenched as a condition of employment under the terms of the collective agreement. During this stage

approximately two to three hundred instructors enrolled in the program each year and participation was mandatory. Morale fluctuated, with instructors in a "good" course expressing delight and those in a "poor" course expressing dismay. The inconsistency of quality led to an inconsistent product. The process suffered from dichotomous treatment. Although the institutions and the province stated the value of the CAE program, supportive policies and procedures were not implemented so as to ensure value. The Advisory Committee of 1972 lacked role definition, foundered, and dissolved. Problems increased and culminated in a major review in 1976. No single individual or group had responsibility and authority for the program. It appears that the mission of the Department of Education was an intent to make quality instruction in adult education a priority, as expressed in the government's comprehensive Oliver Task Force Report on Post-Secondary Education in Manitoba, 1973. Intentions, however, were never acted upon and, of the specific Task Force recommendations which pertained to teacher training and staff development for instructors in community colleges and adult education, none was addressed.

The second era from 1976 to 1980 could be termed the installation stage. Improvements were attempted and formative evaluations were conducted. Enrolment remained fairly constant and even peaked in the sixth year after the CAE requirement was included in the collective agreement. The terms of the agreement allowed staff a maximum of six years to complete the CAE if they wished to maintain their employment. Thus, fewer people but more course enrolments were recorded in that year. It would seem that those who deemed the program not particularly suited to their needs capitulated to the coercive terms of the agreement because they wished to continue teaching. Staffing procedures for the program perpetuated inconsistent

quality and therefore inconsistent product. According to the annual evaluations by participants, morale and occasionally learning, remained minimal. Dichotomous treatment of process continued with hortatory statements being made about the value of the program while coercive negative procedures of enrolment for purposes of staff development were being considered.

Another interesting phenomenon was the manner in which senior Division administrators sought value and judicious fiscal restraint. Instead of creating a quality program which would attract adult educators and then allowing the rules of the market place to prevail, they ignored negative outcomes and preserved weak structures of program management. The CAE was underfunded in that no position of leadership was designated responsibility for the entire program, quality and consistency of curricula were not addressed, strategic or even tactical planning was not expected, and questionable courses were deliverd gratis by other government departments thereby saving contract costs for lecturers. The mission in this era once again fluctuated. A different political party was in power at this time and, through its practices or lack thereof, appeared to allocate no priority to the quality of post-secondary vocational or adult education. It is particularly interesting to note that, whereas there was centralization in such areas as administration, finance, and personnel within the post-secondary division of the Department of Education, decentralization had always been the norm in the programming area. This was especially counter-productive in the CAE program.

The third era of 1980 to the present could be termed the assessment stage. Research identified a host of problems which was only outweighed by the potential for benefits and impact of such a program. Specific and concrete changes were methodically addressed. While some were able to be

implemented immediately, others required years of data gathering to support the changes. Failures were numerous, for political and administrative reasons. The participation rate was both anomalous and gratifying. In the years subsequent to a long moratorium on growth and hiring, enrolment remained fairly constant and even grew in the category of others or adult educators outside of the colleges and vocational schools. It appeared that value was being perceived, the rules of the market place were working, and the program was attracting a growing number of voluntary enrolments. Faculty morale, although still not in a healthy state, was improving, according to the 1982 evaluations. Staffing procedures had altered the quality and the consistency of the program. This also improved staff morale. Process had not changed. Statements about the benefits and value of the program continued to be made but were never supported by actions or organizational leadership or structure conducive to quality programming. Each member of the CAE Tri-College committee still had this as an additional and peripheral responsibility. If planning was addressed at all, it was only through the voluntary enthusiasm and commitment of the members. The mission had not changed either. Although the political party of the early 70's was again the government majority, they were addressing other major economic and provincial matters. In the Department of Education, the elementary and secondary division continued to receive full administrative support whereas the post-secondary division suffered by comparison. In the two years of this government's tenure, it was acknowledged that there were problems and one sound major senior appointment was made in the Division. At this rate it is possible that another election will occur before improvements can be made or felt in the post-secondary division. Ultimately, it is the students and the taxpayers who are the losers, for a mission can only be fulfilled by action, not by words.

Analysis of the three arbitrary stages of development in the CAE program highlights several possible conclusions. The province can have the kind of product it wishes to support. Such support need not mean increased financial support but does require organizational leadership and a sound administrative structure wherein a locus of responsibility is assigned, authority is granted, and planning and accountability are expected. Community college, vocational high school, and adult education instructors will participate in teacher training programs in one of two ways, reluctantly if they are forced to do so, or voluntarily if they perceive that it meets their professional needs. To date, participation has been more mandated than voluntary although the number of voluntary participants has increased slightly in the past few years. To answer the product question, it appears that the CAE program has had a small but not a significant impact on the quality of instruction in the province and the existing quality could probably be attributed to other factors.

The answer to the process question, derived from this history of the CAE program, is that its value to the institutions and the province lies more in its existence as a concession to a need than in its effect. The mission question yields a dismaying but rather realistic conclusion that the provincial government, through its Department of Education, perpetuates the status quo in post-secondary education by allocating proportionally more priority to elementary, secondary, and university education than to its post-secondary, adult and continuing education division and thereby, although possibly inadvertently, opts for a comfortable form of short range planning which does not address equal opportunity for all of its citizens or even a meritocracy based upon individuals, abilities and performance. It further widens the gap between two distinctly different kinds of post-secondary education and two distinctly different Departmental priorities

and values. Some would call this a meritocracy based upon birth, age, affluence, sex, or geographical location; others would call it discrimination.

It is important to note that this research pertains to only one province and may have limited applicability elsewhere. Furthermore, the conclusions and recommendations are solely the author's although they were based upon the work of others, numerous interviews, historical data, and three years as an active participant in the CAE program and in the Department of Education.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Detailed recommendations could be made for each aspect of the CAE program, its product, process, and mission. All, however, could be subsumed under a general one. As a result of the historical investigation of the Certificate in Adult Education program for instructors of adults in the Province of Manitoba, it is recommended that this teacher training program, which is mandatory for community college instructors and vocational high school instructors and optional for other instructors of adults, be accorded a priority by the Department of Education which is commensurate with the program's potential value to the province, and that a centralized Division position be identified, staffed with qualified individuals, granted functional authority, and be accountable for planning, directing, developing, organizing and evaluating, the CAE teacher training program and articulating it with other degree programs provided by Faculties of Education in the province.

## REFERENCES


Bruner, Jerome S. Toward a Theory of Instruction, (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1966).

Cale, Edgar B. The Emergence of Higher Education in America, (Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova University, 1981).

Curtis, Mark H. "History and Qualitative Methodology," E. Kuhns, S. V. Martorana (Eds.), New Directions for Institutional Research: Qualitative Methods for Institutional Research, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., No. 34, March 1982).

Dressel, Paul L. and Mary Magdala Thompson. College Teaching: Improvement By Degrees, (Iowa: American College Testing Publications, 1974).

Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed, (New York: Herder and Herder, 1970).

Geis, George L. Centre for Teaching and Learning Services, McGill University (University of Manitoba: Distinguished Visiting Lectureship series, February 1980).

Government of Manitoba, Department of Education, CAE file documents, minutes, memos, letters, 1970-1983.

Government of Manitoba, Department of Education, Review, Certificate in Adult Education Program, Manitoba, 1976.

Government of Manitoba, Michael Oliver, Chairman, Report of the Task Force of Post-Secondary Education in Manitoba, 1973.

Government of Manitoba, Regulations 55/67 and 159/72.

Grabowski, Stanley M. and Associates. Preparing Educators of Adults, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981).

Harvey, Claudia and Ria Rovers. "Educational Philosophy and Curriculum Orientations in Higher Education," Office of Teaching and Learning, publication, (Toronto: Council of Ontario Universities, Feb. 1981).

Innes, Robert John. Issues in the Design of a Program of Professional Preparation for Community College Instructors in Manitoba, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Manitoba, June 1980.

Knowles, Malcolm. Self-Directed Learning, (New York: Association Press, 1975).

Knowles, Malcolm. The Modern Practice of Adult Education, (New York: Association Press, 1970).

Kuhns, E. and S. V. Martorana, Editors. New Directions for Institutional Research: Qualitative Methods for Institutional Research, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., No. 34, March 1982).

Martorana S. V. and Eileen Kuhns. Managing Academic Change, Interactive Forces and Leadership in Higher Education, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975).

Pratt, David. Curriculum: Design and Development, (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1980).

Riley, Gary L., J. Victor Baldridge, Editors. Governing Academic Organizations, (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporations, 1977).

Rogers, Carl. Freedom to Learn, (Ohio: Merrill Publishing Co., 1969).

Skinner, B. F. Beyond Freedom and Dignity, (New York: Knopf, Inc., 1971).

Takeuchi, Stuart M. "Planning Support From The Top: An Application of 'Miles' Law' (Where You Stand Depends on Where You Sit)," (Boulder, Colorado: University of Colorado, 1982).

Tyler, Ralph W. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1949).

# APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

MANITOBA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Community Colleges Division
Program Development and Evaluation
227 — 530 Century Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 0V8

December 1981

Dear CAE participant:

Thank you for your valuable contribution to the evaluation which was conducted last summer on the CAE "Subject Development and Evaluation" course. As promised, I am getting back to you with the results. Because I had requested anonymity on your submissions, I now must reply to all those who were registered in that particular subject over the past year.

When I spoke to you, I outlined three possible consequences of the review: that the subject would be retained, or changed, or discontinued. Your detailed evaluations generally found the topic valuable for the CAE program, but specifically registered many complaints and outlined suggestions for change.

The CAE Tri-College committee seriously considered all of the evaluations and made the following recommendation:

> That Subject Development and Evaluation be retained as a core subject in the Certificate in Adult Education program, that the objectives and outline remain essentially unchanged, but that use of the written guides be discontinued.

This recommendation attends to the concerns regarding the behaviouristic approach, the inconsistencies in directions, the repetition in content, the onerous number of assignments, and the evaluation scheme. It is effective immediately, consequently the Summer 82 classes will be different in nature. The effectiveness of this procedural change can only be assessed by conducting another evaluation next summer.

Please pass the word around and discuss this with your peers so that those who have completed the subject will be aware of the changes, and those who will be taking the subject next year will expect a different format and an evaluation, and will also know that we do act on your concerns.

Thanks again for all your help.

Sincerely,

Chairperson, CAE Tri-College Committee

APPENDIX 2

## Philosophy

The education of adults is a recognized and desirable aspect of life in a technological society and in a world of increasingly rapid change. Because an adult's education depends, in part, upon the competence of the instructors, it is desirable that individuals in the teaching profession be able to apply adult education theory and methodology. Knowledge and skills in andragogical principles and methods are no less important than expertise in a subject field; both enhance the effectiveness of adult educators and adult education.

## Description

The Certificate in Adult Education (CAE) is granted upon successful completion of a six subject, 36 credit hour, course in andragogical knowledge and skills. The goal of the CAE is to promote excellence in the teaching of adults, and the corresponding objective is to provide instructors with the theoretical and practical bases for becoming effective teachers in a college setting.

Instructors in colleges are all teachers of adults but, at the same time, they have varied subject or trade backgrounds. The CAE course is therefore a flexible one comprised of three "core" subjects and three options.

As the program is presently structured, there are three required subjects which must be taken in sequence. The three optional subjects may be selected on the basis of individual need and availability. Emphasis in the CAE program is on diagnosis, planning, motivation, methodology, resources, and evaluation, all relating to adult education.

APPENDIX 3

CAE course content should cover the following functions:

1. Diagnosis

   Assessing the needs - individual, institutional, societal -- for relevant learning.

2. Planning

   Planning a sequence of experiences which will produce the desired learning. Formulating objectives to meet the assessed needs and designing a program of activities to achieve these objectives.

3. Motivation

   Creating conditions which will cause the learners to want to learn.

4. Methodology

   Selecting the most effective methods and techniques for producing the desired learnings.

5. Resources

   Providing the resources - human and material - necessary to produce the desired learnings.

6. Evaluation

   Assessing the effectiveness of the program and also helping the learners to measure the outcomes of the desired learning experiences.

APPENDIX 4

CAE Meeting
August 13,14,1980

d) Guidelines for Implementation of New Subjects

The guidelines for implementation of new subjects were discussed; minor emendations and additions were proposed. The following guidelines were approved by the committee.

Subsequent to the submission and preliminary review of an initiation form for a new subject, the initiator shall be invited to attend a CAE meeting to discuss the proposal. The committee shall then review the proposal, paying particular attention to need, suitability, and program enrichment. If it is approved, the following procedures shall be followed.

1) There will be a search for similar programs being offered elsewhere.

2) If similar programs do exist, copies shall be obtained and reviewed.

3) A decision will be made regarding the appropriateness of these materials for local needs.

4) If no similar programs are found, the CAE committee, in conjunction with others such as the initiator and qualified college personnel, shall produce a topical outline and general objectives for the new subject.

5) A person whose credentials and expertise match the required subject shall be hired under contract to teach the subject. This person shall be expected to develop and submit prior to the beginning of classes a detailed outline, including specific objectives, which can be used in future by the CAE committee.

6) The initiator shall be provided with a copy of the detailed outline and an opportunity to suggest possible revisions.

7) The CAE committee shall direct a review of the subject within the year after it has been offered in the program.

APPENDIX 5

ITEM III: Criteria for Selection Procedures for CAE Instructors

1. The committee agreed to the following criteria:

   a) Academic qualifications

      i) Graduate degree in Adult Education preferable
      ii) Recent research in the field an asset.

   b) Experience in Adult Education. Priority will be given in this order:

      i) Teacher Educator in adult education
      ii) Adult vocational educator
      iii) Certified Teacher

   c) Acceptable past performance in CAE (if applicable)

2. The process for considering applicants should be as follows:

   a) The curriculum vitae of applicants shall be circulated prior to the CAE meeting.

   b) Applications shall be jointly evaluated by all members of the committee.

   c) A reference check will be mandatory.

   d) Short-listed local applicants will be interviewed.

   e) Other short-listed applicants shall be contacted and interviewed via telephone calls.

   f) Where qualifications of short-listed Canadian applicants are similar, or when committee members are in doubt about a final selection, both candidates should, if possible, be interviewed. Arrangements should be made giving primacy to two main objectives, i.e. obtaining the best instructional staff possible, and incurring the least possible cost.

3. In regard to advertising for CAE instructors, the committee recommended the following:

   i) advertising to run in mid-September,
   ii) closing date for applications, October 31,
   iii) consideration of applications in November,
   iv) verbal commitments and contracts in December,
   v) if required, a second advertisement will be placed immediately, specifying a closing date and the subject areas in which there is still a need for staff,
   vi) non-Canadian applicants may not be considered until after the second closing date.

4. This procedure will be tried out in 1980-81. As well, advertising will be sent to Canadian post-secondary institutions and will be placed in Community College Canada and in the Association of Universities and Community Colleges newspaper.

APPENDIX 6

## Current Sub-Agreement



5:05 This Article respecting Compensatory leave does not apply to Community College Instructors or Teachers of the Deaf.

INSTRUCTOR ACCREDITATION

6:01 Each Community College Instructor shall be required to attain the Certificate in Adult Education or an equivalent qualification acceptable to the employing authority and each Teacher of the Deaf and Teacher Institutional shall be required to obtain a certificate in Special Education or an equivalent qualification acceptable to the employing authority.

6:02 Except where the employee has been assigned instructional responsibilities, Community College Instructors, Teachers of the Deaf and Teachers Institutional shall complete at least one course toward accreditation each summer during periods of non-instructional assignment. The employee's vacation period shall be reduced by the number of calendar days on which the course is scheduled. No employee will be put in a deficit position with respect to vacation credits as a result of taking these summer courses.

6:03 Failure to make progress towards accreditation may be viewed as sufficient grounds for denial of an increment or termination of service.

VACATIONS

Community College Instructors (including those designated as Department Heads) and Teachers of the Deaf

7:01 All provisions of the Master Agreement respecting vacations shall apply to all employees under this Sub-Agreement except for Community College Instructors, Teachers of the Deaf and Teachers Institutional.

7:02 For Community College Instructors, Teachers of the Deaf and Teachers Institutional, all provisions of the Master Agreement respecting vacations shall apply with the exception of those specific provisions to the contrary outlined in this Section.



## Proposed deletions.



7:01 Subject to Section 7:04, the relevant sections of the Master Agreement respecting the rate of accumulation of vacation credits and long-service vacation benefits, will not apply to Community College Instructors, Teachers of the Deaf and Teachers Institutional and instead their rate of accumulation of vacation credits will be determined as follows:

a) Community College Instructors and Teachers of the Deaf shall accumulate vacation credits at the rate of three and one-quarter (3¼) days for each full month of employment during the academic year September 1 to August 31.

b) Coordinators shall accumulate vacation credits at the rate of three (3) days for each full month of employment during the academic year September 1 to August 31.

c) Effective September 1, 1980, Teachers Institutional shall accumulate vacation credits at the rate of three and one-quarter (3¼) days for each full month of employment during the period September 1 to August 31.

7:04 a) Community College Instructors and Teachers of the Deaf and Coordinators shall receive time off with pay during that period between Boxing Day and New Year's Day designated by the employing authority as Christmas break.

b) Coordinators shall be available for work on request during the period defined as Christmas break.

c) Subsection 7:04(a) does not apply to employees who are on a leave of absence without pay.

7:05 Subject to the applicable provisions of the Master Agreement, vacation shall be taken by an employee during periods in which no instructional or teaching responsibilities with a class have been assigned

38

5:05 This Article respecting Compensatory Leave does not apply to Community College Instructors or Teachers of the Deaf.

## INSTRUCTOR CERTIFICATION

6:01 Each Community College Instructor shall be required to attain the Certificate in Adult Education or an equivalent qualification acceptable to the employing authority and each Teacher of the Deaf and Teacher Institutional shall be required to obtain a certificate in Special Education or an equivalent qualification acceptable to the employing authority.

6:02 Except where the employee has been assigned instructional responsibilities, Community College Instructors, Teachers of the Deaf and Teachers Institutional shall complete at least one course toward the Certificate in Adult Education each summer during periods of non-instructional assignment.

6:03 Failure to make progress towards Certification may be viewed as sufficient grounds for denial of an increment or termination of service.

## VACATIONS

Community College Instructors (including those designated as Department Heads) and Teachers of the Deaf

7:01 All provisions of the Master Agreement respecting vacations shall apply to all employees under this Sub-Agreement except for certified Community College Instructors, Teachers of the Deaf and Teachers Institutional.

7:02 For Community College Instructors, Teachers of the Deaf and Teachers Institutional, all provisions of the Master Agreement respecting vacations shall apply with the exception of those specific provisions to the contrary outlined in this Section.



7:03 Subject to Section 7:06, the relevant sections of the Master Agreement respecting the rate of accumulation of vacation credits and long-service vacation benefits, will not apply to certified Community College Instructors, Teachers of the Deaf and Teachers Institutional and instead their rate of accumulation of vacation credits will be determined as follows:

a) Community College Instructors, Teachers of the Deaf, and Teachers Institutional who are certified shall accumulate vacation credits at the rate of three and one-quarter (3¼) days for each full month of employment during the academic year September 1 to August 31.

b) Coordinators shall accumulate vacation credits at the rate of three (3) days for each full month of employment during the academic year September 1 to August 31.

7:04a) All Community College Instructors and Teachers of the Deaf and Guidance Officers shall receive time off with pay during that period between Boxing Day and New Year's Day designated by the employing authority as Christmas break.

b) Coordinators shall be available for work on request during the period defined as Christmas break.

c) Subsection 7:04 (a) does not apply to employees who are on a leave of absence without pay.

7:05 Subject to the applicable provisions of the Master Agreement, vacation shall be taken by an employee during periods in which no instructional or teaching responsibilities with a class have been assigned.